

Application No. 10/588363
Responsive to the office action dated August 5, 2009

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 is directed to a structure including a transparent material and a cured material formed from a curable composition as supported by the specification page 3, lines 1-13, page 85, line 16 – page 86, line 1, page 89, lines 24 – page 90, line 6, page 98, line 11-21, table 1 on pages 102-103, and table 4 on page 106. Accordingly, claims 24 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 2-23 have been amended editorially. The amendment to claim 4 is further supported by the specification at page 86, lines 2-4.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10-13, and 19-25 have been objected to because of informalities. Claims 4, 6, 7, 10-13, 15, and 19-25 have been amended to remove “any one of” from the claims. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 has been objected to because of informalities. Claim 19 has been amended to remove the typographical error. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, has been amended to define a structure that includes a transparent material and a cured product formed from a curable composition through claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2, which recites several types of the transparent materials, such as a building material, a construction material, a civil engineering material, a transportation material, a material for automobiles, i.e., materials to be used in these areas, is a proper dependent product claim. Accordingly, this claim is clear, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/588363
Responsive to the office action dated August 5, 2009

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully note that it is not clear in the Office Action whether claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim 2 has been amended to clarify that the materials in this claim are those useful in particular fields. As noted above, claim 2 is a proper product claim, which is one of the categories listed in 35 U.S.C. 101. Accordingly, the rejection on the basis of 35 U.S.C. 101 also should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 also has been amended to clarify that the structure, not the curable composition, further includes the layer having photocatalytic activity-based antistaining properties provided on a surface of the transparent material. Thus, it is clear that the layer is not the cured product formed from the curable composition in the claim.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and is clear for the reasons as discussed above.

Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-14 and 19-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanamori et al. (International Patent Application Publication No. 02/085985), translation provided by U.S. Patent No. 7,297,743. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kanamori discloses a curable sealing composition that is used for general architectural use (see abstract and coln. 1, lines 47-51 of the '743 patent). Kanamori, however, does not disclose a structure including a transparent material with a cured product from the curable composition formed thereon as claim 1 recites. In addition, even if the UV absorber included in the curable composition of the reference were considered similar to the antioxidant included in the composition of claim 1, in the reference, examples that include the UV absorber such as examples 1 and 4, do not have superior properties to those of examples that do not include the UV absorber such as examples 2 and 3 (see table 1 in colns. 27-30). In contrast, the structure of claim 1, which includes the antioxidant, provides much superior weather resistant adhesion between the cured product and transparent material after

Application No. 10/588363
Responsive to the office action dated August 5, 2009

being exposed to the tested weather condition for 1000 hours or longer, relative to the structure that does not include the antioxidant in the structure (see examples 1-10 and comparative examples 1-4 in tables 1-2 and 4 on pages 102-103, 104, and 106, respectively, and page 106, lines 33 – page 107, line 3 of the specification). Kanamori in no way suggests that the properties of the structure such as excellent adhesion between the transparent material and cured product could be obtained. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-14 and 19-25, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are distinguished from Kanamori, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanamori et al. (International Patent Application Publication No. 02/085985), translation provided by U.S. Patent No. 7,297,743, as evidenced by Fujita et al. (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2000-178456), translation provided by U.S. Patent No. 7,081,494. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 15-18, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are distinguished from Kanamori for at least the same reasons as discussed for claim 1 above.

Fujita discloses a curable composition (see abstract) but discloses neither a structure including a transparent material and a cured product from the curable composition formed thereon nor that the curable composition includes an antioxidant as claim 1 recites. Fujita also does not recognize the advantages that the structure of claim 1 enjoys such as improved adhesion as discussed for claim 1 above. Accordingly, Fujita does not remedy the deficiencies of Kanamori, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/588363
Responsive to the office action dated August 5, 2009

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.



Dated: November 5, 2009

DPM/my/jls

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300